

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 6-14, 22-24 and 28 stand rejected. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1-4, 15-21, and 25-27 would be allowable if certain informalities are addressed. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22 are amended. The amendments do not raise new issues because no new structure or steps have been added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

With respect to claim 4, the Examiner states that it is not clear whether the recitation of a "*packet time delay*" and subsequently, "*the packet delay time*" are equivalent. The Examiner suggests amending claim 4 to replace the instance of "*the packet delay time*" with the "*packet time delay*". Applicants have amended claim 4, as suggested by the Examiner.

With respect to claims 1, 4, 15, 18, and 20, the Examiner states that it is unclear what is meant by "*a time interval between received data frames and excludes times of the data frame*". The Examiner objects to claims 2, 3, 16, 17, 19, 21, 25-27 due to their dependency from the above claims. The Examiner suggests amending the claims to recite "*a time interval between reception times of two data frames, and said time interval excludes processing times of the data frames*". Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 15, 18 and 20 as suggested by the Examiner.

Withdrawal of the claims objections is respectfully requested.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

(1) Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Connor [U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0061426], in view of Bennett [U.S. Patent No. 6,345,302].

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 4. Accordingly, claim 11 is patentable over Connor and Bennett.

(2) Claims 12-14, 22-24, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Connor, in view of Satran et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0029305) (hereinafter “Satran”), Gentry Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,467,008) (hereinafter “Gentry”), and Bennett.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 4. Accordingly, claim 12 is patentable over Connor, Satran, Gentry, and Bennett. Moreover, claims 13-14 are believed to be patentable over said combination at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 12.

Claim 22 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 20. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over Connor, Satran, Gentry, and Bennett. Moreover, claims 22-24 are believed to be patentable over said combination at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 22.

(3) Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Connor, in view of Gentry, and Satran.

Claims 6 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 4. Accordingly, claim 6 is believed to be patentable over Gentry, and Satran. Moreover, claim 7 is believed to be patentable over said combination at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 6.

(4) Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Connor, in view of Satran.

Claim 8 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 4. Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable over Connor and Satran.

(5) Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Connor, in view of Gentry and Bennett.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 4. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentable over Connor, Gentry, and Bennett. Moreover, claim 10 is believed to be patentable over said combination at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 9.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that this amendment raises no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because no new structure or steps have been added and previously recited elements have only been emphasized.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Robert J. Newman
Robert J. Newman
Reg. No. 60,718
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury-Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Telephone: (516) 692-8888
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889